REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-96 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 20, 28, 34, 35, 41, 44, 49, 50, 64, 67, 68, 81, 84, 85, 92, 95, and 96 have been amended. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-96 will be pending under consideration. No new matter has been introduced by the present amendment. Support for the claim amendments relating to using the CIC value and at least one point code in the lookup can be found throughout specification, including page 28, lines 1-8. Support for the claim amendments relating to selecting between entries in the CIC routing database corresponding to MGCs that share a point code can be found, for example in Figures 5-7 of the specification. More particularly, in Figure 5, MGCs **182** and **184** share a point code of 1-1-2. In step **ST4** in Figure 6, the CIC routing node performs a lookup in the CIC routing database using the OPC, DPC, and CIC to select among entries with the same DPC. In the example in Figure 7, the CIC routing database has multiple entries corresponding to 1-1-2, which is the shared point code of MGCs **182** and **184**. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the specification supports all of the claim amendments. Reconsideration of the present application as amended and based on the remarks set forth herein below is respectfully requested.

Telephone Examiner Interview

Applicants greatly appreciate the Telephone Examiner Interview granted them on August 25, 2004. In the Telephone Examiner Interview, Applicants indicated that they would amend each of the independent claims to recite that the lookup in the CIC routing

database use the CIC value in combination with at least one point code in the signaling message to select among entries corresponding to media gateway controllers that share the same point code. Allowing media gateway controllers to share point codes conserves point codes in the network. For example, the present specification states:

> Once again, the ability to add multiple MGC type nodes to a network without requiring a different unique SS7 point code for each MGC type node represents a major operational benefit to network operators. As discussed above, such is the case because there are a finite number of SS7 network point codes available for use by all network operators that deploy SS7 networks. At present, the acquisition of new SS7 point codes represents a significant problem for network operators attempting to expand their networks by deploying additional service nodes, such as MGC type nodes. (See page 26, line 21 through page 27, line 4 of the present specification.)

Thus, from this passage, one advantage of the CIC routing lookup and the CIC routing database in each of the independent claims of the present specification is that it enables point code sharing among media gateway controllers and similar nodes.

LaPier was also discussed in the Interview. In particular, Applicants pointed out that LaPier does not disclose that network access servers **118** have point codes, or that network access servers **118** share point codes. According to LaPier, each SS7 circuit is identified by an originating point code, a destination point code, and a circuit identification code. LaPier also states, "given information identifying a barrier circuit, the signaling access server **112** can determine a valid route for the signaling message that will control the circuit." (See column 31, lines 34-52 of LaPier.) Thus, LaPier states that bearer circuit identification information can be used to determine routes for signaling messages. However, there is no disclosure in LaPier that networks access servers **118** have a point code, not to mention a shared point code.

At the conclusion of the Interview, the Examiner agreed that the claim amendments distinguished over LaPier. The Examiner indicated that the case would be allowed pending results of a further search and agreed to contact Applicants' agent to resolve any minor issues.

Claim Objections

Claims 20, 95, and 96 were objected to because of informalities. Regarding claim 20, the Examiner states that the word "he" should be corrected. Applicants have replaced the word "he" with "the" in claim 20 to correct the typographical error.

Claims 95 and 96 have been amended to depend from claim 81, a claim reciting a computer program product. Originally the claims were inadvertently written to depend from claim 64.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 20, 95, and 96 overcome the objections to the claims and that the objections should now be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicates that copies of items 4-10 in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on July 2, 2001 were not found in the file wrapper of the parent application, and the Examiner could not obtain the cited references. The Examiner also indicates that the references were not considered. In the Information Disclosure Statement attached hereto Applicants submit copies of items 4-10 and request consideration of these items. The documents submitted herewith and that correspond to items 4-10 of the July 2, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement include:

Publication by Tekelec entitled "Eagle® Feature Guide," Publication PN9110-1225-01 (January, 1998).

Publication by Tekelec entitled "Eagle® STP Platform," Publication 908-0126-01 (1997).

Publication by Tekelec entitled "STP Lan Interface Feature," Publication 908-0134-01 (1997).

Publication by Tekelec entitled "STP Database Transport Access Feature," Publication 908-0136-01 (1997).

Publication by Tekelec entitled "STP X.25 to SS7-IS.41 Protocol Conversion Feature," Publication 908-0135-01 (1997).

Publication by Tekelec entitled "STP ANSI-ITU Gateway Feature," Publication 908-0133-01 (1997).

Publication by Tekelec entitled "SS7-Frame Relay Access Device SS7 Protocol Information Translator," Publication 908-0167-01 (1997).

Claim Rejections 35 Under U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,333,931 to LaPier et al. (hereinafter, "LaPier"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, each of the independent claims has been amended to recite that the lookup performed in the CIC routing database is based on the CIC value in combination with at least one point code in the message to select among entries in the routing database corresponding to media gateway controllers that share a point code.

There is absolutely no disclosure of this feature in LaPier. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments overcome the rejection of the claims as anticipated by LaPier.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. **50-0426**.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON & TAYLOR, P.A.

Date: August 26, 2004 By: _____

Gregory A. Hunt
Registration No. 41,085

Customer No. 25297

1322/21/2 GAH/BJO/sed